## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

# IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

### FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

## **DIVISION THREE**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CARL AROLDO WILLIAMS, JR., Defendant and Appellant.

A134702

(San Mateo County Super. Ct. No. SC73514B)

Carl Aroldo Williams, Jr., appeals from a judgment and sentence following his no contest plea. His court-appointed counsel has filed a brief seeking our independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. We find no such issues and affirm.

### **BACKGROUND**

Redwood City police officers testified at a preliminary hearing that Williams was apprehended after a brief pursuit following the report of a residential burglary in progress. Based upon a citizen report, officers were on the lookout for a silver car occupied by two African-American men. The car occupied by Williams and his accomplice was identified as the one involved in the burglary through a partial license plate number. Officers pursued the car after the driver failed to heed their signals to pull over. The pursuit ended when the car failed to negotiate a turn and crashed. Williams and the driver were caught when they attempted to flee on foot.

Officers found property in the car that the burglary victims identified as their own. Neither of the victims knew Williams or his accomplice, and never gave them permission to be in their home or have their property.

At the police station, a detective advised Williams of his constitutional rights, including his right to remain silent. Williams agreed to speak with detectives, and admitted to the burglary.

Williams was charged by information with first degree burglary under California Penal Code section 460, subdivision (a), grand theft under Penal Code section 487, subdivision (a), and possession of stolen property under Penal Code section 496, subdivision (a). He initially entered a plea of not guilty to all the charges, but later entered a no contest plea to first degree burglary and grand theft pursuant to a negotiated disposition. The burglary allegation was amended to specifically allege it was a serious felony, and the possession of stolen property charge was dismissed. It was agreed that Williams would be placed on probation on the condition that he serve a year in the county jail.

The court determined that Williams made a free, knowing and intelligent waiver of his constitutional rights. Sentence was suspended and Williams was placed on probation in accord with the negotiated disposition.

### DISCUSSION

Counsel has represented that he advised Williams of his intention to file a *Wende* brief in this case and of Williams's right to submit supplemental written argument on his own behalf. Williams has not done so. Williams has also been advised of his right to request that counsel be relieved. This court has reviewed the entire record on appeal. No issue requires further briefing.

## **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

	Siggins, J.	
We concur:		
McGuiness, P.J.		
Pollak, J.		

A134702